



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,439	11/16/2000	Shelton Louie	1205-002/JRD	5706
21034	7590	03/30/2004	EXAMINER	
IPSOLON LLP 805 SW BROADWAY, #2740 PORTLAND, OR 97205			JAKETIC, BRYAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/715,439

Applicant(s)

LOUIE ET AL.

Examiner

Bryan Jaketic

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-7 and 9-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denenberg in view of Horwitz et al. Denenberg et al disclose a method for taking prescription orders through a retail pharmacy having a plurality of spaced apart locations comprising the steps of receiving the prescription order at a first location upstream of a will call storage area (col. 9, lines 64 through col. 10, line 4); entering data into a computer system at a second location (16); tagging a carrier of the prescription order with a barcode (col. 6, lines 30-38); manually storing the filled prescription at one of a plurality of storage locations having a plurality of cubbies (14, 18, 20); detecting the prescription order at one of the plurality of storage locations with a barcode reader (col. 8, lines 46-50); recording the location of the prescription order (col. 6, lines 39-47); and displaying the location on a computer display (col. 13, lines 27-47).

Denenberg et al further disclose the steps of automatically collecting timing information, storing the timing information, and compiling workflow information based on the timing information (col. 16, lines 1-43). A worker can be automatically signaled when the prescription order exceeds a predetermined amount of time (col. 16, lines 30-43). The workflow information may be associated with a particular worker to evaluate worker efficiency (col. 16, lines 2-5).

Denenberg et al do not disclose a tag that is detachably secure to the prescription order or that is rigidly secured to the prescription. However, detachable and rigidly secure tags are both common in the art, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a rigidly secured tag with the invention of Denenberg et al to ensure that the tags aren't mistakenly lost. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a detachable tag with the invention of Denenberg et al, so that the tags may be re-used.

Denenberg does not teach the step of detecting the presence of the prescription order at a first station upstream of a storage area. Horwitz et al teach the use of an RFID tag and reader for locating items (see Fig. 4). Horwitz et al teach the step of detecting the presence of an item at a first station (124) and tracking the item upstream of a storage area (108). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the system of Horwitz with the invention of Denenberg et al to help individuals locate prescriptions or prescription information anywhere within the pharmacy.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denenberg et al and Horwitz et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pilarczyk. Denenberg et al and Horwitz et al teach all of the limitations of the claim except for a teaching of notifying a pharmacy worker if a refill prescription has been prematurely submitted. Pilarczyk discloses a system for prescription compliance that notifies a worker if a refill has been submitted prematurely (col. 10, lines 5-28). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Pilarczyk with the combination of Denenberg et al and Horwitz et also that a pharmacist may make note of premature refills.

4. Claims 44-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denenberg et al in view of Isaacman et al. Denenberg teaches all of the limitations as described in paragraph 2 of this Office Action. Denenberg et al do not teach a tag reader for each cubby or that items are placed in a cubby without indication from a computer system. Isaacman et al teach a tracking system with an RFID tag and reader (see Fig. 3). Isaacman et al teach that an item can be placed on any shelf or in any drawer without indication from a computer system, and the items will be tracked (see Abstract; Fig. 4; col. 4, lines 45-53; and col. 8, line 61 through col. 9, line 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Isaacman et al with the invention of Denenberg et al to track items in drawers without indication from a computer system to reduce human error.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mon teaches a tracking system that employs RFID tags to track items in storage.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan Jaketic whose telephone number is (703) 308-0134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703)308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bj



3/26/04